

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed on October 5, 2004, all pending claims 1-27 were rejected by the Examiner. By the present Response, claims 1, 14, 20 and 27 are amended, and new claims 28-35 are added. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-35 will pending in the present application.

The claims pending at the time of the Final Rejection were rejected in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,823,948 to Ross, Jr. et al. (hereinafter "Ross"), and in view of Ross in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,960,406 to Rasansky et al. (herein after "Rasansky").

In the Advisory Action mailed on January 12, 2005, the Examiner indicated that the claims were being interpreted in view of Ross, particularly in view of passages of Ross at col. 5, lines 5-10 and 35-52, such that the inaccessibility of certain processing spaces was considered to be read on by files created that are not available to patients. The present invention is not related to dictation or other files that are inaccessible in some way to patients as taught by Ross. The amendments to the independent claims 1, 14, 20 and 27 are intended to more particularly point that the data that is stored in the secure data repository or first processing space is data that is generated by a user, and inaccessible to the user. That is, the Ross reference relates to data which is created by medical professionals and not data that is created by the user (patient). Nothing in the Ross reference would indicate that the medical professionals who generate the data have any limited access to the data. Indeed, the reference is replete with teachings as to what these users do with the data. Accordingly, the amendments are intended to more particularly point and distinctly claim the nature of the data which is stored in the first processing space.

Applicants reiterate that, as argued in the Response to the Final Office Action, which arguments are hereby incorporated in their entirety by reference, the passages relied upon by the Examiner in Ross do not in any way indicate that data is moved from a first or secure processing space to a second processing space for generation of a report as claimed. Accordingly, all of claims 1-27 are to be clearly patentable over Ross, and Ross in combination with Rasansky.

New claims 28-35 have been added by the present Response. The claims are similar to claims already pending in the application, but make more clear that in accordance with the aspects of the invention the controlled access processing space is not accessible to an intended recipient of a report. Accordingly, data is stored in the controlled access processing space and then used to generate a report that is made accessible to the intended user. Neither Ross nor Rasansky, nor any of the other prior art relied upon by the Examiner, discloses or even suggests this type of processing arrangement. Accordingly, the new claims are also believed to be patentable over the prior art of record.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/5/2005

Py
Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545